

# THE REBEL

Vol. 1. No. 11.

CALGARY, ALBERTA, DECEMBER 3, 1937

10 Cents.

## ABERHART IS 'DEAD'

'Funeral' Arrangements in  
Hands of Lieut.-Governor,  
Pending Decision of Court

Although it is probable that Premier Aberhart will regard this announcement of his "death" as slightly exaggerated, it is undeniably true that he is dead—politically dead, beyond all possibility of resurrection. Nothing that he can say or do—no compromise that he may be willing to make in order to save his skin, no pleading for a "square deal," no cajoling, bluffing, no "forgiving" of "enemies," no tearful "confession of sins," nor any other trick will avail him anything but further condemnation. Recent developments have shown beyond the possibility of doubt that Aberhart is dead, and all that remains to be done is to bury his political corpse in the pit of disgrace and dishonor which he has dug for himself. Our prediction is that the funeral will take place shortly after the Supreme Court has conveyed its decision on the Alberta bills now before it to Lieutenant Governor Bowen and that this gentleman will have the pleasure and privilege of performing the last rites.

Our Premier declares that he cannot discern even so much as a "crack in the roof" of the Social Credit structure. Well, Mr. Aberhart has demonstrated on more than one occasion that he could not "see straight," morally, politically or metaphorically. He will never see a "crack" in any "roof" of this alleged Social Credit structure, for the all-sufficient reason that there is no such roof. There is not even a structure to support a roof, and according to Mr. Aberhart himself the debris has not even been cleared away for a foundation.

As usual, Mr. Aberhart is viewing the scene a la Nelson—with the telescope to his blind eye. The clear evidence of his senses means nothing to him. The overwhelming defeat of his camouflaged forces in the Edmonton bye-election and civic elections there did not appear to impress him as a condemnation of his government. The equally decisive trimming meted out to his party pets in the Calgary civic contest left no apparent dent in his rhinoceros hide. And while this was written before the Lethbridge election results were known, we predict that these, too, will indicate repudiation of the Aberhart party, and

(Continued on Page 2)

## By Their Votes Ye Shall Know Them

It is not at all unreasonable to assume that if Premier Aberhart and the majority of his followers in the House had possessed even ordinary decency, the "Bankers Toadies" incident would not have developed into a first-rate scandal destined to disgrace their government throughout the land as an aggregation of moral cowards. If these fine, "Honorable" gentlemen (and two ladies) had been honestly concerned with maintaining the honor and dignity of His Majesty's Legislature, if they really

believed in the principle of British fair play, so constantly on their lips, yes, if they were even ordinary, garden-variety "sports," they would not have declined Mr. Duggan's very reasonable request to have the author and printer of the offending leaflet brought before the committee of privileges and elections.

But it is quite evident that these people did not want to be fair to Mr. Duggan. His honor as a member of the legislature, the honor and dignity of the legislature itself, which they are pledged to uphold, were of no concern. For some reason known only to themselves, it was of more importance to SHIELD those responsible for the affront to a fellow-member of the House.

It is not possible to reconcile pious mouthings of fair play with such a cowardly act. By their votes they went on record, as on so many other occasions, that whenever, in the furtherance of their political scheme, they are faced with the necessity of choosing between right and wrong in PRACTICE, they must of necessity take the path of dishonor. They cannot do otherwise without completely repudiating "social credit" itself.

As several members have recently professed repudiation of the leaflet and one of them—MacLachlan—went so far as to declare under oath that he was not positive how he voted on the Duggan motion, we show here how the official journals of the legislature record how the votes were cast.

For the motion: Anderson, MacLellen, Barnes, Hansen, Chant.  
(Continued on Page 2)

## THE IMPORTANCE OF 'Little Incidents' IN THE LIVES OF MEN

SHAKESPEARE: "But then I sigh, and, with a piece of Scripture, tell them—that God bids us do good for evil: and thus I clothe my naked villainy with old, odd ends stolen forth of Holy Writ; and seem a saint, when most I play the devil. Why, I can smile, and murder while I smile; and cry content to that which grieves my heart; and wet my cheeks with artificial tears, and frame my face to all occasions."—"IT IS TIME TO FEAR WHEN TYRANTS SEEM TO KISS."

### TO PREMIER ABERHART.

Sir.—In the course of one of your recent "sermons" from your political pulpit you referred to an incident in the life of Stonewall Jackson and pointed out very properly that "little incidents" in the lives of great men often explained their greatness.

You are quite right. "Little incidents" do indeed show the true characters of men. But not only in the direction of greatness. They are also the mark of a man in the direction of meanness, hypocrisy, etc.

We are delighted that you attach so much importance to the significance of "little incidents" as a measure of character, for as a matter of cold fact, it is chiefly because of the "little incidents" in your public conduct that we hold you in such contempt and have for so long condemned you as morally unfit to hold public office. As you may know, our criticism of you has never been on the score of Social Credit as such, but upon your

(Continued on Page 3)

# THE REBEL

Editor and Publisher—J. J. Zabick

426 - 15th Street N.W., Calgary, Alberta

"INDEPENDENT ALWAYS—NEUTRAL NEVER"

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Calgary, Alberta

## ABERHART IS DEAD—Continued from Page 1.

that he will pooh-pooh the evidence as of no significance—unless, of course, his candidate should win.

It is undoubtedly true that Social Credit has not collapsed. How could there be a collapse of something that did not exist! But Aberhart, the personification of that vague "figment of the imagination" which has been pawned off as Social Credit in Alberta, has very definitely collapsed. Aberhart was the "social credit" of Albertans. He and he alone it was who gave to this nebulous nonsense a fleeting illusion of reality. It was in him THE PEOPLE placed their trust, a trust akin to worship. They did not even want to understand what it was all about. "Their's not to reason why," theirs but to shout and cry—to "demand results."

But Aberhart committed suicide. He is dead—dead from the poison of his own lies, slanders and cowardice. Having stolen his way into power by fraud and deception, he was compelled to continue in the same way, a victim of his own crookedness. But as the pitiless glare of truth began to reveal him in his real colors, as contempt and disgust for him grew with every exposure of his duplicity, as he was forced from one untenable position to another equally unstable, as he was made to swallow his own falsehoods, so did Aberhart's prestige and influence decline. Today he is "done for." Inexorable Justice, relentless in her pursuit of the unjust, has caught up with him, and today Aberhart stands stripped naked of his pilfered honor—the most pitiable figure in Canadian history, undone by his own folly.

That Aberhart has not enough sense to quit the stage when he knows that his little act is over, matters little now. It may even be a good thing. He can do no further harm to the province, and a little extra time for vain strutting will only disgrace him all the more. The circumstances are undoubtedly such as to warrant the lieutenant governor in dismissing him now, but it is perhaps just as well that he should "let things ride" until the Supreme Court has rendered its verdict. In the meantime Albertans may proceed to lay in a big supply of "good spirits" for celebration of the "wake" at the funeral of the over-ripe political body of the lamented Brother Aberhart.

## BY THEIR VOTES YE SHALL KNOW THEM—Continued.

Hugill, Tremblay, Bowlen, O'Connor, Morrish, Duggan, Irwin.

Against the motion: Tanner, Fallow, Manning, Aberhart, Low, Mullen, Maynard, Mrs. Gostick, Mrs. Rogers, Cain, King, Bourcier, Foster, Ansley, Masson, Robinson, McPherson, Brown, Hooke, Mac-Millan, James, Hayes, Popil, Sharpe, Wingblade, Ash, Beaudry, Lamp-ley, Lush, MacLachlan, Duke, Flamme, Holder, Ingre, Tomyn.

## "A Square Deal for Everyone"

Poor Aberhart! He has a terrible time with his slogans! His latest creation, a streamlined, airflow contraption designed to produce the old Coue auto-suggestion effect, was a flop from the beginning. Brother Aberhart made the mistake of trying to give a personal demonstration of the gadget without having made sure that it was in working order, and the thing back-fired. "How do you do?" he said to a man during his Bible Institute broadcast, grasping him by the hand, "I'm for a square deal for everyone. How about you?" And like a true-blue Social Crediter caught off guard, the reply came: "I WANT MINE FIRST." Not so hot! Not so hot! But, not to be rebuffed by one failure, he tried the same stunt on another man; and back came another stunner: "I've never had a square deal."

We hope that the two replies he got to his slogan taught Mr. Aberhart a lesson. We hope it dawned on him that in those two replies is contained the entire philosophy of Social Credit as he has preached and practiced it. He must know in his heart that the essence of Social Credit as propounded by him is the very antithesis of a

"square deal." Aberhart has preached and practiced a gospel of greed and selfishness, especially designed to appeal to those who want "something for nothing," who in self-pity are always whining about never having had a square deal, but who, if anything is to be had, always want theirs first regardless of whether the deal is on the square or crooked. One of the basic "principles" of Social Credit is to demand RESULTS without ever bothering to worry about the "methods"—or deal—by which these results are obtained.

The choice of the slogan was particularly unhappy in that it is in such glaring contrast with Aberhart's actions. The supreme gall of a man whose record is one of "misdeals" and cheating, sponsoring a "square deal" slogan! The presumption is on a par with the blasphemy—"Ye gods!"—with which he concluded the program in the course of which he coined the slogan.

## Duggan's "Diabolical Lie"

In company with Frank Cusack, that irrepressible Irishman with the foghorn voice whom Socreds love not at all, we attended a meeting some time ago at which the Hon. Lucien Maynard was one of the speakers. At the close of Mr. Maynard's address Mr. Cusack asked him to give the audience the facts in regard to the cost of the administration and interest costs of the infamous prosperity certificate scheme with which the Aberhart government tried to fool the people.

Mr. Maynard did not give the figures as to these costs, but he did say that D. M. Duggan's statement in the House to the effect that the certificates had cost the government over 40 percent was a "diabolical lie." He added that, on the contrary, the government was "MONEY AHEAD" from the operation of the prosperity certificate scheme.

Now, it is, or at least should be, a serious matter when a Minister of the Crown accuses a member of the legislature of having uttered a "diabolical lie." When Mr. Maynard represented Mr. Duggan as a diabolical liar, his audience loudly applauded his allegation. Mr. Maynard is supposed to be an honorable gentleman. He is a Cabinet Minister. So, perhaps, Mr. Duggan is a diabolical liar. Mr. Maynard says so. And Mr. Maynard is an honorable man.

Of course, on the other hand, the Honorable Mr. Maynard may not be as honorable as a man in his position should be. In describing Mr. Duggan as a diabolical liar he may have used the Aberhartian standard of "accurate information." Our recollection is that Mr. Duggan's statement in the House was not that the prosperity certificate cost had been over 40 percent, but somewhere around 30 percent. The important fact, however, according to our information, is that Mr. Duggan's figures were supplied by the treasury department of the government itself. They are a matter of public record. Are we to assume, then, that the government's own record in the matter is a "diabolical lie"? The assumption would appear necessary if we are to believe Maynard's statement that the government was "money ahead" on the scheme.

So far Mr. Duggan has not replied to Maynard's accusation. It is highly important that he do so. It is not conducive to the maintenance of a high standard of public morality that a Cabinet Minister should hold a fellow member of the House up to public ridicule and contempt as a diabolical liar. It is therefore in the public interest that Mr. Duggan make reply. Undoubtedly he will do so. And our guess is that when he does, Lucien Maynard will eat crow like a good little boy.

## INVITATION ACCEPTED

Just at press time we were informed that one of the Riverside Social Credit groups had passed a resolution to the effect that we were to be asked to appear before its members to explain the reasons for our opposition to the government. Our understanding is that the request is the outcome of an address we made in the German language at a public meeting in Riverside school during the civic election campaign.

While the invitation has not as yet been officially conveyed to us, we desire to assure the Riverside Social Crediters that we shall be only too pleased to appear before them at any mutually convenient time. Further, we commend them for their apparent willingness to hear the other side of the case, and we trust that they will not permit higher-ups in their party to dissuade them from carrying their resolution into effect. It is their opportunity to set a splendid example to Social Crediters throughout the province.



## THE IMPORTANCE OF 'LITTLE INCIDENTS'—

(Continued from Page 1)

method and manner of presentation. Our objections have been to your lies, your deceit, your slanders, your cowardice, your advocacy of boycott and bigotry, and, chiefly, to your slimy prostitution of the Word of God to further your political ambitions. Since long before the election we have dealt mainly with the "little incidents" of your public conduct, with the moral and ethical aspects of your METHODS of deluding the people. It was indeed because our public leaders failed to deal with these "little incidents," which we considered so fundamental, that we started this publication.

Let us review a few of the "little incidents" of your public life and try to determine whether they mark you as a great man or as the coward and liar we say you are. To be up-to-date, we shall start with the very "sermon" in which you brought the matter up.

In the opening remarks of this address you expressed yourself as "somewhat horrified" at the manner in which some people were allegedly "scoffing" at your prayers. You said to your audience: "You know whom I mean; you have read it." Is it the mark of a great man or of a coward to make such a vague charge? You charged, further, that "they"—whoever "they" are supposed to be—were saying or suggesting that only the righteous and not sinners should come to pray. You know that this is untrue, and you know further that you deliberately invented the falsehood. Only a "little incident," but highly significant.

Then you went on to make public confession of how great a sinner you are. Another "little incident" of very real significance. The public knows without any special advice from you in the matter that you are indeed a very great sinner, and you know that the public knows it. So what was the motive behind your confession? It cannot be that you were confessing your private, purely personal sins, in which the public has no interest whatsoever. Therefore, were you confessing your public sins? Were you pleading guilty to the charges of public misconduct which have been made against you, and in respect of which you ARE responsible to the public? This is important. The public has the right to know. Or is it, perchance, that your real motive behind the confession was to use the pose as a boast of righteousness, and which would therefore be of the very essence of hypocrisy?

That your confession of sins was only a sham appears clear from the fact that a few minutes later you parted yourself on the back as a great hero. Without blushing you told your audience of the tremendous sacrifices you had made to serve the poor, suffering people. You told them that you could have sat back and done nothing about all this misery, but that out of your great love for humanity you had decided to enter the fray. You would keep on fighting bravely against the terrific odds against you and all the "unfair attacks" would matter not at all. You wound up your self-praise by modestly comparing yourself with Joan of Arc. How do you reconcile such bragging and self-exaltation with your confession of iniquity and pose of humility?

And then you touched on the subject we had raised in our letter to you in our last issue—the "calling of names." You said: "Why call each other such names as liars, hypocrites, scoundrels, etc.?" Either in self-justification or in accusation, you admitted that "all men are liars," and then went on to illustrate the spirit of magnanimity that should prevail by citing a "little incident" from the life of the great Lincoln. Stanton had instructed a messenger that in addition to delivering a message to him he should also tell Lincoln that he (Lincoln) was a fool. Lincoln's reply was that "Stanton is generally right; I'll go to see him about it."

Well, Aberhart, you know that we have more than once suggested a "show-down" on this calling of names. But neither your confession of sins nor your repetition of

the trite maxim that "all men are liars" will suffice to meet the demands of this situation. We know why WE call YOU a liar, etc. It is because you really ARE a liar and all the other things we have said of you, and you know that we know it. But have you any excuse whatsoever for calling others such vile names as rats, sons of Satan, liars, useless asses, fornicators, howling wolves, vicious rowdies, etc.? Have we not also pleaded with you, in public, and in personal letters, to put us right if you think us wrong? Are we to judge by your silence that we are right? If so, why have you not followed Lincoln's example and come to "see us about it." Let us consider a specific example, one of which you have full knowledge. When the first issue of this publication came out, what did you do? Did you come to us in the spirit of good-will which you now profess toward those whom you call your "enemies"? You did not. You went, instead, to two Calgary lawyers and even to your then attorney general. Then, thwarted in your ambition to muzzle us, you stepped into your pulpit and there you first pretended contempt, next you threatened, then you changed your pose to one of "forgiving them that persecute you," and now you have switched to a pharisaical confession of your sins. The appearance of The Rebel provided a ready-made "little incident" of which you might well have taken advantage to prove your "greatness," if you had any. But you "missed the boat." Instead, your attitude toward us so far has only served to prove our every contention as to your smallness, meanness and cowardice.

In conclusion, we would again remind you that your pose of magnanimity toward your opponents is all wrong. It is not for you to say that you "forgive" them for their alleged persecution. It is for you to beg forgiveness of them for YOUR public sins against THEM. As a servant of the people it is not your privilege to act as judge and jury over your public conduct. That is the privilege and duty of the public. YOU are the prisoner at the bar. YOU are on trial, and it is the rankest presumption and hypocrisy for you to pretend to "forgive" your judges. So quit your stalling and take your medicine like a man.

## S. C. Standard of Merit

JUNIUS: WHEN ONCE A MAN IS DETERMINED TO BELIEVE, THE VERY ABSURDITY OF THE DOCTRINE DOES BUT CONFIRM HIM IN HIS FAITH.

The Hon. Lucien Maynard has been an apt pupil of Aberhart in the latter's special form of trickery in sublimating the absurd and ridiculous. He demonstrated this capacity for deception in the course of a recent address when he took special pains to emphasize that the more violent and abusive the criticism, the more certain should Social Crediters be that the government is on the right track. In brief, he made the intensity of adverse criticism the measure of Social Credit truth and progress. He was, of course, careful not to point out that if his logic were good, the degree of Social Credit criticism would likewise be an excellent standard by which to judge the value of opposition proposals.

We have long ago observed that one of the tricks of Social Credit strategy is the old, dishonest psychological crutch of the moral and intellectual coward of obtaining credence for a proposition, not by clarifying and reducing it to simple terms, but by deliberately confusing a simple proposition, making it so involved and absurd as to go beyond rational comprehension. Aberhart employed this mean trick in order to gain power and it has been used consistently as the principal weapon of defence and attack by the government since it assumed office.

The government's principal concern appears to have been to produce legislative and other functional absurdities. Its record has been the perpetration of one absurdity after another for the express purpose of strengthening the faith of the gullible by the resultant confusion of issues. Invariably, opposition criticism was pictured as selfish, unfair, and as proof of the inferent merit of the absurdity. It was not intended that followers of the government should UNDERSTAND what was being done, but merely that they should be deluded into BELIEVING that they understood. Thus, by subtle flattery, they were misled into

(Continued on Page 6)

# Social Credit IS Fascism

OFFICIAL ORGANS OF ENGLISH AND CANADIAN FASCISTS  
GIVE FURTHER SUPPORT TO CONTENTIONS  
PROVING SIMILARITY OF PRINCIPLES

We submit it as a reasonable assumption that with Fascism in actual operation in various countries, Fascists KNOW what Fascism IS.

We submit it as an equally reasonable assumption that as Social Credit so-called is NOT in operation anywhere in the world, Social Crediters so-called are not in a position to demonstrate what Social Credit IS.

Therefore we submit that when Fascists, who know what Fascism is, declare that Social Credit so-called IS Fascism, we are justified in concluding that they are right.

From time to time we have contended that in its fundamental essence Social Credit is Fascism. In our last issue we received support for these contentions from Dr. R. M. Johnstone, western organizer for the Canadian Union of Fascists, who, although assailing us bitterly, was most emphatic in his assertion that "Aberhart IS a Fascist." And now we have further support for our views from The Thunderbolt, official organ of the Canadian Fascist organization. In commenting on our editorial of some time ago in which we quoted the Jewish paper, "The Day," in a translation of its reference to a report in Sir Oswald Mosley's Fascist organ, "Action," to the effect that Mosley were seeking a united front of Social Crediters and Fascists in England, and our suggestion that Communism, Fascism and Social Credit were founded on like principles, The Thunderbolt says:

"The above is all very amusing and may sound convincing to the politically illiterate, but we give the editor of The Rebel the credit of having more intelligence than to believe what he writes. In the first place, the world is NOT divided into Social Crediters and anti-Social Crediters as our friend seems to imagine. Mr. J. J. Zubick need only look at the 'popular' press to realize that the world is being divided into Fascists and anti-Fascists, with the latter afflicted with the 'democratic' disease, cold feet."

We agree heartily that in the main the world is being "divided into Fascists and anti-Fascists." Social Creditism, we agree, simply does not exist, and that which goes under the name of Social Credit must in reality be counted as Fascism. That in fact has been our contention.

The Thunderbolt continues: "Social Credit IS Fascist in so far as it fights finance and works toward national and individual security and prosperity. Social Credit is non-Fascist in so far as it fails in its task, allows itself to be outwitted by the financial interests and permits Communist penetration of its ranks. Communists up until the last year have constantly and steadily opposed Social Credit on the behalf of their masters, the Jewish financial interests. Now, realizing they can do most harm by penetrating and USING Aberhart's party, they BREND friendship for Social Credit and enmity to the banks, whose interests they serve. That is why the Communist party now 'supports' Aberhart and backs ANY MISTAKES HE MIGHT MAKE."

Here again we have only support for what we have already said. The thing that appears to bother our Fascist friends somewhat is our suggestion that their principles and those of the Communists are similar. They don't like our implication that the principles of both are rooted in the same philosophy of regimentation, coercion and dictatorship. We do know this, that although Fascists claim to be opposed to Communism and say Social Credit is Fascism, the Communists are supporting Aberhart. As to why Alberta Social Crediters allow themselves to be supported by the Communists, we can only surmise that they are either unutterably stupid or else think themselves smart enough to outwit the latter in their maneuvers. Whatever the motive, we know that these two supposedly antagonistic parties are co-operating in at least outward harmony.

However, in our general analysis we are in substantial agreement with The Thunderbolt and Dr. Johnstone, and we can therefore only conclude that their objection to our criticism of Aberhart is not that they would protect Aberhart, but the cause of Fascism which he repre-

sents. They realize that while Aberhart may not be fully aware of the fact that he is a Fascist, he is playing directly into their hands, and they do not want his crookedness exposed because they fear that the exposure would scotch the natural transformation of Social Credit into official Fascism. The same selfish motive lies behind Communist support. The communists are backing Aberhart simply because they hope that his blunderings will result in a state of confusion out of which their opportunity for grasping power will emerge.

Now, with reference to the article in "Action," let us see whether or not it is in substantial agreement with the claim made by "The Day" and with our own contentions. We quote from the article in question as it appears in "Action" under date of September 17, 1937. The article is under a DOUBLE PAGE heading, "National Socialism and Social Credit," with the sub-head, "Similarities Are Many And Differences Not Irreconcilable." On one side of the heading there is a picture of marching Blackshirts and on the other the smiling face of "Social Creditor No. 1, Major C. H. Douglas." We quote pertinent extracts from the article:

"It is one of the characteristics of the present confusion of men's minds—a confusion which is being consciously fostered by anti-social forces—that men often fail to distinguish between those who are their natural enemies and those who are their natural allies. The half-conscious antipathy between Social Crediters and National Socialists is a case in point. . . . Let us consider why."

"The Social Creditor has started from an analysis of financial costs which has laid bare the ramp of the Financial Monopoly. He has ended by envisaging a kind of society which would be possible if this monopoly could be superseded by a national control."

"The National Socialist has started with a picture of society as he feels it ought to be. He has ended by discovering that the evidence of the Financial Monopoly is the principal obstacle of its realization."

"Therefore, though starting from different points, Social Crediters and National Socialists inevitably have much in common. This becomes evident if one studies the propaganda of the two movements."

The article then proceeds to enumerate many of the similarities of aim in the two movements and says:

"In view of these essential similarities, Social Crediters and National Socialists should regard themselves as belonging to the SAME FRONT, instead of looking askance at each other."

A summary of differences is then made, the writer concluding that these are inconsequential. He says:

"If we now jump a stage and assume that each movement has arrived at power, what differences do we discern? NONE, as to the great objective of setting up a national control of the National Credit. NONE, as to the principle that (in Mosley's words) 'the consumption of goods . . . be equalled to the production of wealth, and that that production be greatly increased.'"

Then the writer makes his really telling point. He proves that even the differences in the conceptions of the nature of the State exist only in theory and not in practice. The Fascists, he points out, "argue that nothing but a STRONG State could overthrow the Money Power, and that for a considerable time to come a strong government would be essential." Social Crediters, he says, "rarely face these questions. They usually SEEM to assume that if once the necessary legislation could be passed to initiate the National Dividend and the Just Price, the national life would henceforth flow so smoothly that happiness and prosperity would be almost automatic."

He then points out that this PROFESSION of liberty on the part of Social Crediters is but a pose, and that for practical application of Social Credit, restrictive penalties and rigid control are in fact prescribed by Douglas himself in his writings on the subject. He quotes from Douglas' "Plan for Scotland" and also points to Alberta as proof of his contention that IN PRACTICE Social Credit must employ the principles of Fascism. We in Alberta know this to be only too true.

The truth of the matter then appears to be that while Fascists are straightforward in their advocacy of a "strong state"—of regimentation and force—Social Crediters try to fool the people with PROFES-



SIONS of liberty while as a matter of fact they have regimentation in mind for application in PRACTICE. We have the proof of this in the acts of the Douglas-ruled Alberta government, which is even now actually applying Fascist principles.

The tragedy of the situation is not in that Fascism should be introduced here. If the people want it they should and will have it. The tragedy lies in the perpetration of the criminal hoax—in the consequences of the particularly vicious form of deception by which Aberhart gained power as an apostle of "true democracy" and the "economy of God," under the meaningless but catching slogan of Social Credit. The tragedy is in the disruption of the province by the hatred, bigotry, contempt for law and order and the pollution of morality and religion by a racketeer of the lowest order.

However, Albertans are "wise" to Aberhart's racket. They are beginning to realize that Nazism, Fascism and Social Credit are one and the same thing. The fact of Aberhart's cowardly duplicity is becoming more widely recognized every day, and recent developments are the clearest possible indication that Albertans are anxiously waiting for the opportunity to completely repudiate this conscienceless demagogue and all his works.

## FAIR ENOUGH, GENERAL!

In the trial of J. H. Unwin, M.L.A., on the charge of defamatory libel, copies of *The Rebel* were introduced into the proceedings by the defence apparently for the purpose of embarrassing Maj-Gen. Griesbach because of a letter from him in one of the issues. However, it would seem that the attempt was a boomerang instead, as indicated by the reply of the General to a question by his attorney, G. H. Steer, K.C.

Said Mr. Steer: "Just one moment, please. My learned friend has made some point about you having written this letter to the *Rebel* as found in exhibit 7. Do I understand from your letter that you approve of everything that is printed in that publication?"

General Griesbach: "No. I would not undertake that. I undertook to say that the intention of this paper of bringing to the light of day some facts in this discussion in connection with this whole political matter is worth while. I consider it is a good job. It is replying to allegations and statements made, to innuendos, and they have not been replied to heretofore, and this should result in some progress being made. My general impression was that they were vigorously written, and they were based on facts, and they were worth while."

Mr. Steer: "I thank you."

We, too, thank the General. In his estimate of *The Rebel* General Griesbach went right to the crux of the matter. We do not expect anyone to agree with everything we say. Our purpose has been and is to "bring to the light of day" facts pertinent to the discussion and solution of Alberta's peculiar political problem, fundamental facts which were being neglected and without the fearless presentation and discussion of which there can not, in our opinion, be any solution of the problem. To have our efforts in this direction recognized as "worth while" by one of the standing of General Griesbach is most encouraging.

## ABERHART POISON AT WORK

**Cowardly Boycott of Bonnyville Newspaper is Logical Consequence of Aberhart's Gospel of Bigotry and Intolerance.**

Time and again Aberhart has declared from his pulpit—where his words should take on the quality of a sacred oath—that he is all for British fair play. That he has, in the same breath, from the same "holy" place also time and again flatly contradicted these professions by uttering sentiments diametrically opposed to British fair play is equally well known, which no doubt explains his reluctance to PRACTICE fair play when a situation offers him the opportunity to translate his professions into reality. We can understand therefore why he has not rebuked those of his fanatical followers who have been carrying on a campaign of boycott against the Bonnyville *Nouvelle*, which has for some time been the target of this most cowardly form of persecution.

The latest aggregation of slimy, yellow cowards trying to intimidate *The Nouvelle* is the Cold Lake Social Credit Group, which in a letter signed by E. H. Martin in behalf of the group, condemns this courageous weekly "for its stand in defence of the banks and privilege interests and

for the unfair criticism published by its editor." The letter reads further, in part: "The boycott is a procedure that is sometimes unfairly used, but in this instance unfairness must be fought with unfairness, and therefore we approve heartily the boycott now being exercised."

If Aberhart is as solicitous over preservation of the spirit of British fair play as he piously claims from the pulpit of his Pathetic Bible Substitute, if he is as magnanimous toward his "enemies" as he professes, if he honestly believes, as he says he does, in the Scriptural injunction to "bless them that persecute you," why does he not put a stop to this disgraceful violation of the very essence of British fair play?

We'll tell you why. It is because Aberhart is himself the chief proponent of this creation of Hell. He got it direct from the Devil himself, and, as Satan would do, took this spew of the Pit of Evil into a pulpit, from where, amidst his deceptive religious incantations, he broadcast the vile idea for the express purpose of poisoning the minds and souls of his dupes against the truth. It is Aberhart who popularized the boycott as a weapon for the intimidation of opponents, as a means for inciting his followers to hatred and bigotry, and as a camouflage for his lies, crookedness and cowardice.

That is why Aberhart does not rebuke his followers for their cowardly conduct. How, indeed, could he do so? These poor, misguided zealots are but carrying into practice the unspeakably vile precepts and examples with which Aberhart has contaminated their minds. It is Aberhart who, with fiendish cunning, has elevated the degrading, mind- and soul-destroying vice of boycott to a virtue, and it is he who must be held primarily responsible for the moral corruption of his weak-minded dupes as well as for the consequences of their ill-advised conduct. While their action must be condemned as disgusting and cowardly, more pity than blame is due the poor fools who allowed themselves to be deceived by this arch-hypocrite Aberhart, for it is he who is the purveyor of the mental, moral and spiritual opium which has aberrated their minds, perverted their consciences, polluted their moral perceptions and blackened their very souls.

But the day of reckoning is drawing nigh. The day cannot be long delayed when Aberhart must harvest the fruit of the seeds of hatred, discord, falsehood, cowardice and intolerance which he has sown broadcast throughout this province. And what a harvest it will be! For the rest of his natural life Aberhart will be forced to eat the bitter fruit of his villainy in the presence of public contempt and disgrace.

## The True-Blue Pledgers

The resentment Premier Aberhart is reported to have expressed at the closed Social Credit meeting in Calgary last Friday over the failure of thousands of signers of the "true-blue" pledges to vote the party ticket in the local civic elections, is a forceful reminder that the intent behind the pledge scheme was to use it as a moral club to enforce "loyalty" to the government.

The vicious principle of the scheme is also its poison, and the sooner Aberhart realizes that his "plebiscite without the expense" was just another boomerang, the better it will be for him.

For a citizen to bind himself with a political pledge is immoral. It is an insult to the intelligence and a violation of the conscience. It is everything that is opposed to the dignity and responsibility of a free citizen. And a political party which would use such despicable methods for the degradation of citizenship merits only contempt and repudiation.

## A BLACK EYE FOR LABOR

While it is true that the decision of the Labor party to compromise with Social Crediters in the Calgary civic elections was carried by only one vote, it will never the less take Labor a long time to recover from the injury it did to itself by the act. Apparently Labor was fooled by the false cry of "unite the progressives," one of the latest trick slogans of the Social Credit party—the party whose basic principle is to have no principles and whose robber-creed, "Results, Not Methods," allows it to stoop to any methods to further its aims. Certainly there is nothing "progressive" in the philosophy of regimentation and suppression both preached and practiced by this party.

However, if the Labor party has learned the lesson that in matters involving the sacrifice of fundamental principles "methods" are always more important than "results," the experience will not have been in vain.



## THE INCREDIBLE TRUTH

MACLEAN'S MAGAZINE LEARNS THAT TRUTH IS STRANGER THAN FICTION.

"Crisis in Alberta" is the title of an article in Maclean's Magazine of December 1, in which W. A. Irwin, associate editor of that publication, paints a fairly accurate picture of the Alberta political situation. At any rate, he did as well as could be expected from an outsider who would attempt, after only a few days of study, to make sense of a situation which, he admits, "suggests a fantastic jumble of bitter conflicts, fanatic credulity, wild unreason, passionate hope and hysterical hatred." We cannot deal with the entire article, but we would do so with one paragraph in which reference to our publication is clearly indicated. It reads:

"The language used on both sides privately, and in many cases openly, is wildly intemperate. Threats of physical violence are not uncommon. Intermittently there appears for open sale on the streets of Calgary and Edmonton an anti-Government paper which for sheer violence of political invective belongs in the class of the near-incredible. Why it hasn't been used for libel or worse is a puzzle. A recent issue called on 'good citizens' to resist the government by force. And it is openly supported by the contributors who are men of standing in the province, some of them national figures."

It is too bad that Mr. Irwin did not call on us during his visit, as we feel that we could have assisted him materially in unscrambling the jumble of conflicting impressions to which his mind was subjected during his brief stay in Aberhartia. We could have convinced him, we think, that the one and only cause of Alberta's condition of strife and unrest was the "gospel" Aberhart preached to gain power. And the essential elements of this gospel are, by coincidence perhaps yet quite logically, expressed by Mr. Irwin himself in his analysis of the effect as he discovered it—a "fantastic jumble of bitter conflicts, fanatic credulity, wild unreason, passionate hope and hysterical hatred." We in Alberta know the tree from which this fruit grew.

We could have proven to Mr. Irwin too, we think, that the reason why for "sheer political invective" The Rebel "belongs in the class of the near-incredible" is that we are but recording events that are near-incredible. In essence, all we have done is to watch the government and report the facts, and if the record is near-incredible, it is because the facts are so. This simple explanation should also solve for Mr. Irwin the puzzle as to why we have not been "sued for libel and worse."

We could also have demonstrated that the reason why "men of standing" have supported us is not that they are hysterical or fearful, but because they are realists and have the courage to face the facts as they are and in a manner appropriate to the demands of the situation. Men like Bill Irvine, General Griesbach, Lon Cavanaugh and Mayor Andy Davidson are not of the hysterical type. On the contrary, if it had not been for the vigorous fight put up by these men and others of their calibre for sanity and reason at a time when the Douglas-Aberhart-Powell-Byrne "visible and audible" demonstration campaign reached such dizzy heights of frenzy, the situation might very easily have gotten out of hand. And in this fight The Rebel played its little part in putting the "fear of the Lord" into the craven hearts of those fanatics who were doing their best to push the province over the brink of ruin.

We are not criticising Maclean's, but merely giving that excellent publication some information. There is however one correction which we should like to make. When Mr. Irwin says that in one recent issue we "called on 'good citizens' to resist the government by force," he is not quite right. This is what we said: "Good citizens must and will now defy the government by refusing to submit to its tyrannical and morally criminal laws, using force if necessary to defend their sacred rights of free conscience and personal liberty." We stand by that, and it is not splitting hairs to contend that this is not a plain advocacy of resistance by force. It is a perfectly justifiable enjoiner to defense of personal liberty against attack by a cowardly tyrant. In this we went no farther in spirit than the opposition member of the legislature, whom Mr. Irwin also quotes, and who said of the same laws: "There is only one means of defense for the people who are subjected to such legislation as this, and that is to refuse to abide by it." That was sound advice. It expressed, further, the determination of thousands, and it

was the expression of such sentiments, supported by public opinion which made the political gangsters at Edmonton realize that they were going too far. That same spirit of determination must be maintained

## MR. SPEAKER "APOLOGIZES"

RAHEL. "A STRAIGHT LINE IS SHORTEST IN MORALS AS WELL AS IN GEOMETRY."

The Honorable the Reverend Mr. Peter Dawson, M.L.A., is a true Social Creditor, at least in that he is afflicted with that peculiarly Social Credit disease of evasiveness which almost invariably manifests itself whenever a member of that party is "put on the spot." A recent experience with him indicates to us that Mr. Dawson undoubtedly is suffering from the characteristically Aberhartian form of amnesia which is turned on whenever convenience does not harmonize with the dictates of conscience.

Some time ago Mr. Dawson addressed a meeting in Marshall school near Vulcan and it was reported to us that he had made some rather nasty remarks concerning The Rebel. We don't care what anyone says about us, provided he has the backbone to say it openly and is prepared to take the consequences. So, in order to be fair with Mr. Dawson, we asked him to let us know just what he had said about our publication and that if, as reported to us, he had charged us with publishing lies, we would expect him to either substantiate his accusation with proof or to apologize. We have Mr. Dawson's "apology" in a letter under date of Nov. 23, from which we quote:

"Dear Sir: Your letter of the 20th inst. came as a surprise to me. I was not conscious of having said anything of a derogatory nature at Marshall school against one J. Zabick. I have no written speech and my notes do not contain the word Zabick. However, if anything was said in a derogatory manner, let me assure you it was said inadvertently, and I apologize."

The evasion is not even clever. It is a crude attempt at wriggling out of an unpleasant position. Mr. Dawson knows that his "apology" does not make sense. He KNOWS whether he did or did not make certain accusations against us, and no amount of equivocation about not having been "conscious" of having offended against "one J. Zabick" by what he might have said "inadvertently" can meet the situation. If he is not "conscious" of any guilt, why apologize?

We must therefore reject Mr. Dawson's apology as worse than no apology at all, and we inform him that we shall expect him to do one of three things: (1) Substantiate the accusations he is alleged to have made against us; (2) Deny flatly that he made them; or (3) Offer an unqualified apology. It will be to Mr. Dawson's advantage to make up his mind in this matter without undue delay.

## "If the Cap Fits—Wear It!"

A GUESSING CONTEST FOR 13-YEAR-OLDS

"If I thought of this creature at all, it was with amused contempt, as one thinks of other parasites that clutter up our lives."

"During the last two years I have, to my sorrow, been brought into direct contact with this creature, and have had it under close observation, and have found to my surprise and dismay that it is very far from being the harmless, futile insect I had supposed."

...I have had a 'close-up' or almost microscopic view of it.... and the result of this intensive investigation has led me to the CERTAIN KNOWLEDGE that because he appears to be harmless, and because he cloaks his odiferous character and designs with high-sounding phrases and moral platitudes, because in Legislative chambers and on public platforms he protests so vehemently and plausibly his good intentions, because by lies, half-truths and vicious slanders he deceives the people into believing that HE AND HE ONLY is their champion, fighting in their behalf, while all the time he is betraying them.... because of these things, and because of what he is, I have found him to be the most deadly enemy we have to combat."

No, gentle reader, although the foregoing fits friend Aberhart rather well, we did not compose it. The quotations are from an article by N. B. James, M.L.A., entitled "The Professional Politician" in a recent issue of the Hon. Lucien Maynard's paper, "Today and Tomorrow."



## S. C. STANDARD OF MERIT—Continued from Page 3.

regarding their wishful and blind acceptance of the absurdity as proof of their superior wisdom. What fool does not like to be made to feel that he is wise and to be flattered into thinking that he is intellectually capable of grasping the most involved proposition! The logical result of this trick is that the more illogical, involved and absurd the proposition, the more eagerly it is swallowed as gospel truth.

But, "you cannot fool all the people all the time," and even those who want to be flattered become resentful when they finally discover that advantage has been taken of their gullibility. The signs are that the government has just about exhausted its bag of tricks. In fact, it is trying to play some of its old ones over again, as for instance the bank legislation, which is doing its second turn of deception. Of perhaps far deeper significance, however, is the government's exposure of its moral cowardice as exhibited in various acts recently. When first brought into play as a trick in the case of the disgraceful compromise with the insurgents, it served, as was intended, the purpose of creating in the minds of government supporters just the opposite effect—that it was proof, not of cowardice, but of courage. When the same spirit was displayed in the repeal of the Recall Act in order to save Aberhart's rhinoceros hide, there were still many in whose eyes this despicable act of cowardice had the appearance of virtuous courage. But when all but one of the Social Credit members voted against the Duggan motion in the House demanding investigation of the Bankers' Toadies leaflet, no doubt some began to wonder just what sort of honor and courage these professors of British fair play really had. Then, with the same yellow streak displayed in the government's refusal to prosecute Unwin and Powell on the two criminal charges on which they were subsequently convicted, more people began to wonder as to just what sort of gang we have in control of affairs; and when the attorney general "rubbed it in" by staying legal proceedings against these same men on two even more serious charges, the deception could fool only the hopelessly blind.

Thus the government itself is exposing its crookedness and cowardice by the consistency of its dishonorable conduct. It could not do otherwise. The inherent falsity of the central doctrine to which it is committed can be preserved only by fraud and deception. Truth, honor and courage would be fatal to its existence. Therefore, lie must be piled upon lie, one absurdity be covered by yet another. The inevitable result of such a contradictory procedure is however that it ultimately collapses under the weight of its accumulated deceptions. The crash of the Aberhart structure of fraud cannot be avoided much longer.

## James' Contempt of Court

N. B. James, M.L.A., Aberhart's erstwhile pinch-hitter at his Edmonton political pulpit, has again broken out in a rash of disrespect for Canadian courts of justice. At a Social Credit meeting in Wetaskiwin a short time ago he not only advocated the election of judges by popular vote, but alleged that "travesties of justice are occurring all over the Dominion" and urged Social Credit groups to send strong protests to the governor general.

Newspaper reports do not state whether or not he gave any specific instances of these alleged "travesties of justice," but among other things he is reported to have said in this connection that "a certain gentleman is taking a six months' holiday, and the atmosphere of Alberta will be purer after his departure."

In true Social Credit style, James thus made his slandering accusation, not like a man of courage, directly and specifically, but in the characteristically Aberhartian manner—by inference and innuendo. There can be no doubt but that by "a certain gentleman" he meant Chief Justice Ives, the judge who tried Unwin and Powell, and who has announced that he is going on a six months' holiday.

There is no more despicable coward than the mean, spineless skunk who will stab a person in the back by the slimy, sneaky method of suggestion and inference. N. B. James, M.L.A., belongs in that class. One can admire an honest opponent who will fight openly, in attack or defense—a man who has the decency and courage to face and name his adversary. But there is no more contemptible scoundrel than the murderer of reputation who shoots his poison darts of slander from the ambush of innuendo.

It is quite apparent that James is anxious to use the Unwin and

Powell cases for the purpose of still further arousing contempt for law and order. His past record in this direction is well known. It was he who, from the Aberhart pulpit, read his party's infamous "declaration of war" at a time when government members were bending all their efforts toward inflaming their supporters to "visible and audible" demonstrations and indignation meetings against the federal authorities.

Mr. James should be taken in hand. He is a member of the legislature and as such should not go unchecked for his flagrant contempt of our courts of justice.

## HOLY WILLIE'S PRAYER

"ALL HAIL, RELIGION I MAID DIVINE!  
PARDON A MUSS SAE MEAN AS MINE,  
WHO IN HER ROUGH, IMPERFECT LINE  
THUS DARES TO NAME THEE;  
TO STIGMATIZE FALSE FRIENDS OF THINE  
CAN NEER DEFAKE THEE."

—Burns, to the Rev. John McMath, M.

O Lord! I praise Thy matchless might,  
When thousands Thou hast left in night.

That I am here afore Thy sight,

Wi' them that follers;

To lead Thy creatures to the Light.

(An' pooch their dollars!)

I ken, that when I preached the Word,  
I yawped too much o' March the Third,  
It's gane lang syne! Wi' hope deferred,

Their hearts are sinkin'.

O, Thou Who rules't the foolish herd—

Keep them frae thinkin'!

I've striven sair to keep frae shame:

I've magnified Thy holy Name;

But noo I'm forced to hunt the game

Wi' yon Communists.

Lord, grant Thy mercy! Dinna blame

Puir opportunists!

I ken they sneer at God, an' prayer.

But aye, Thy wisdom I'll declare!

(An' meanwhile speak yon atheists fair—

Th' silly crat'ur:

They'll find they'll no be anywhere,

If WERE the Greater!)

Things that the wise and prudent ken—

Reveal Thou to Thy chosen men;

When no' to speak; an' likewise when,

Wi' utterance caustic.

Check (if Thou canst!) that crowin' hen,

Yon bletherin' G——!

Judge Thou betwixt the sheep an' goats.

We look to Thee; we've burned oor boats.

Thou kenn'st hoo sair we need the votes—

Dinna prevent it!

If there's a hole in a oor coats—

Leave US tae tent it!

Ilk Sabbath, on the Sacred Theme,

I've fleeced an' flyted, by the ream;

Yet still we're fadin' like a dream—

Oor strength's diminished.

Lord! Send us doon anither scheme;

Or we're a' finished!

An noo, O Lord! Thy servant waits.

Grant that yon suckers tak' the baits;

An' smite Thou not oor candidates.

Though some deny Thee.

Thou kenn'st we're in sic fearsome straits,

We've none forbye Thee!

Oor chances—Lord, Thou kenn'st! are slender.

To please each roarin' Dividend-er;

Oor hoose is totterin'—Lord, defend her!

Baith but an' ben.

An' a' the praise tae Thee we'll render.

Amen! Amen!

—F. G. ROE, Edmonton.

## CHRISTMAS IN ALBERTA

"The feast of friends, the candle-fruited tree,  
I have not failed to honour . . . And I say  
It would be better for such men as we  
And we be nearer Bethlehem, if we lay  
Shot dead on scarlet snows for Liberty,  
Dead in the daylight upon Christmas Day."

—G. K. CHESTERTON.

What shall one say about Christmas in a province of citizens divided by hatred, strife and fear? It is a saddening thought that for the third successive year the people of Alberta are faced with the prospect of celebrating the birthday of the Prince of Peace—while they are warring one against another.

The thought is bewildering, until one recalls that the birth of Christ was also the occasion for the slaughter of some 2,000 innocent babes; a significant reminder that evil exists and will continue to exist in this world so long as man is endowed with a free will. It is a reminder that this vale of tears will ever be a battle-ground for the conflict between good and evil.

The conflict in Alberta is not one between "Social Credit" and the "financial monopoly," but between the evil spirit of greed, avarice, intolerance and suppression as represented by the immoral deception of Aberhart, and the spirit of liberty, tolerance and justice personified in those who would preserve the fundamentals of British democracy.

Our attitude then, in relation to this situation, even during this festive season, when the peaceful scene of the Manger at Bethlehem inspires thoughts of gentleness, should be determined, not by misguided sentimentalism, but by the sentiment of true love. And true love hates evil at all times. It is only as we hate evil—not persons—that we can be said to love the good. Our love of right and justice is a fraud unless exemplified by commensurate hatred of wrong and injustice. One is the measure of the other.

Indeed, if we would be guided by the true spirit of the occasion, we will remember that the sole purpose of Christ's coming to earth was that He might conquer evil. He loved the sinner, but hated the sin. It was for His hatred and denunciation of evil that He was persecuted; and in His final sacrifice He provided the model for all who would truly serve in perfect love.

Therefore, if we truly love freedom and justice, we will not relax our vigilance, not even at Christmas-time, over the principles we hold dear. The forces of destruction under the Aberhart banner, who are seeking to rob us of our liberty, will not be idle during this season.

They will not shun to use even the Blessed Name of the Holy Babe in deceitful promotion of their disruptive designs. To shut our eyes to this evil would be a denial of our professed love of good and truth and honor and liberty; and rather than to thus dishonor ourselves, it would indeed be better . . . "if we lay shot dead on scarlet snows for Liberty, dead in the daylight upon Christmas Day."

## "Prudence"—and "Noblesse Oblige"

J. MASON: "Prudence is a conformity to the rules of reason, truth and decency, at all times and in all circumstances."

"Prudence" was the theme of our Premier's broadcast last Sunday, and while we have no quarrel with his definition of prudence as being a combination of "piety and practical sagacity," we could not help but ponder over the fact that it is for his IMPIETY and IMPRACTICAL NONSENSE—the very opposite of prudence, that he is so vigorously condemned by his critics. It is his imprudence in the impious pollution of religion to promote, foster and maintain a political fraud; his dishonesty, cowardice and generally dishonorable public conduct that is at the bottom of all the widespread opposition to him. That Mr. Aberhart refuses to recognize and deal with this fact is the best proof of his imprudence.

One of his imprudent utterances on this same occasion was his attempted justification of his failure to answer his critics. His excuse was that his opponents shifted about so much with their criticisms and charges as to make it difficult for him to answer. The excuse does not hold water. Mr. Aberhart knows that there are dozens of serious charges against him, standing charges which have not been "shifted," awaiting his attention, and that he has deliberately ignored them. It is Mr. Aberhart who has been doing the shifting and wriggling, to evade his responsibility.

Mr. Aberhart has been most imprudent in his choice of themes, and just to help him out we would offer "Noblesse Oblige"—("rank imposes the obligation")—as a theme for his next broadcast, with the suggestion that he use it as a basis for answering his critics. His position as head of the government places him under the obligation to meet the arguments of his critics openly and honestly. If he is a prudent man, he will honor this obligation. Likewise, the prudent citizen will demand that he do so, and will condemn his refusal as even more reprehensible than he would failure if at least the attempt were made. Mr. Aberhart, "Noblesse Oblige"!

## FINAL ISSUE NEXT MONTH

When we launched The Rebel, we undertook to publish 12 issues. Our next issue, in January, will be Number 12—and our last. You will want a copy of this final issue. Place your order for it with your news dealer now, or send 10c direct to us.

## Back Numbers Available

If your set up to date is incomplete, you may obtain the missing numbers at 5 cents per copy. Back numbers of all issues are still available. Please order by number.

## Complete Set of 12

Order a set for yourself or for a friend. The issues up to date will be forwarded immediately and No. 12 will be mailed when off the press. Post-paid to any address:

50c

REMIT TO

**THE REBEL - Calgary, Alberta**